

REMARKS

In the Office action dated 10/19/2004, claims 51, 56, 59 and 60 were rejected under 35 USC 112. These claims have been canceled.

All the remaining claims in the application were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. This amendment is accompanied by a Terminal Disclaimer which is believed to overcome the rejection.

Reconsideration of the application and its passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles R. Kalmanek, Jr. et al

By: 

Ronald D. Slusky
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 26,585
(212) 246-4546

Ronald D. Slusky
Registered Patent Attorney
353 West 56th Street—Suite 5L
New York, N.Y. 10019-3775
Date: 01/10/2005